

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the present case. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

By this amendment, claim 1 is amended.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects:

Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application EP 0718964 A2 to Kennan (hereafter Kennan) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,801,590 to Kashima et al. (hereafter Kashima).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is distinguishable from the combination of Kennan and Kashima for at least the following reasons:

The Examiner admits that Kennan fails to disclose an electromagnetic coupling preventing member as claimed, and a metal shielding box including one shielding chamber for accommodating the plurality of local oscillators, each including a dielectric resonator, and the preventing member. In an attempt to show this feature, the Examiner imports Kashima. (see Office Action, page 2).

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Kashima discloses a screw that can vary the distance to the dielectric resonator and a shield case. Further, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to combine Kennan's LNB down converter with Kashima teaching to arrive at the claimed invention so as to allow the degree of coupling to be freely set. (see Office Action, pages 2-3). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these allegations.

For example, a close review of Kashima reveals that Kashima absolutely fails to teach or suggest accommodating a plurality of local oscillators each including a dielectric resonator and

an electromagnetic coupling preventing member within one shielding chamber in a metal shielding box, as set forth in claim 1.

Like Kennan, Kashima merely discloses a single local oscillator (3) and a single dielectric resonator within its' shield case (1). (see Kashima, Figs. 1(a), 1(b), 2(a), 2(b) and 3(a)). As such, both Kennan and Kashima fail to disclose one shielding chamber accommodating a plurality of local oscillators, each including a dielectric resonator, and the electromagnetic coupling preventing member.

Furthermore, because both Kennan and Kashima fail to disclose a plurality of dielectric resonators, it is impossible for such references to disclose that the preventing member is extending between any two of the dielectric resonators, as set forth in claim 2.

Kashima merely discloses a single resonator (11) and a screw (9) for finely adjusting the oscillation frequency by varying the distance to the single dielectric resonator (11). Like Kennan, Kashima also is completely silent about having a plurality of oscillator/resonators within a single shielding chamber and having its' screw (9) for preventing electromagnetic coupling between one and another one of the dielectric resonators. In fact, Kashima is completely silent about preventing electromagnetic coupling between adjacent resonators. Kashima is merely concerned with finely adjusting an oscillation frequency.

Furthermore, as disclosed in the Kennan reference, a low noise block down converter generally includes a plurality of dielectric resonators. In addition, as disclosed in the Kashima reference, an oscillation frequency of an oscillator circuit in the low noise block down converter is generally adjusted with a screw. In contrast to these references, the invention of the present application indicates a method of preventing electromagnetic coupling between dielectric resonators in a low noise block down converter including a plurality of dielectric resonators in one shielding chamber.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kashima fails to make up for the deficiencies found in Kennan.

Applicant further respectfully submits that neither Kashima nor Kennan, taken singularly or in combination, (assuming these teachings may be combined, which applicant do not admit) teach or suggest accommodating a plurality of local oscillators each including a dielectric

resonator and an electromagnetic coupling preventing member within one shielding chamber in a metal shielding box.

To establish a *prima facie* case of Obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Kennan and Kashima fail to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

As such, applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Kashima and Kennan for at least the reasons noted above.

As for each of the dependent claims not particularly discussed above, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above regarding their corresponding independent claims, and/or for the further features claimed therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/642,494
Amendment dated August 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 2, 2005

Docket No.: 0033-0897P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant